

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS
EASTERN DIVISION

ALWANNA KNIGHT,)
)
Plaintiff,)
)
v.) No. 12 C 11
)
AURORA LOAN SERVICES, LLC,)
)
Defendant.)

MEMORANDUM ORDER

Alwanna Knight ("Knight") has tendered a bulky pro se submission against defendant Aurora Loan Services, LLC ("Aurora"), the character of which submission can best be gleaned from its caption:

Complaint of Civil Rights Violations
Unequal Protection of the Laws Violations
Judicial Corruption/Conspiracy
Judicial Fraud/Extortion (Stealing Homes)
Disparate Treatment

And if that blunderbuss characterization, coupled with a \$10 million demand, had left any uncertainty as to the dubious nature of Knight's claims, it would be dispelled by reading her "Jurisdictional Statement":¹

Order entered: October 18, 2011
Statute: Unequal Protection of the Laws Violations,
Disparate Unequal Protection of the Laws, Civil Rights
Violations, Reverse Racial Discrimination, Judicial
Extortion, Judge Acting outside of their immunity
provisions, Anarchy, Jim Crowism, Treason, No

¹ That "Jurisdictional Statement" is placed on a page that is headed with a different case caption, obviously copied from a state court mortgage foreclosure action brought by Aurora, in which Knight as mortgagor is one of several defendants.

Jurisdiction on Defendant, Canon Ethics violations,
Judicial Extortion, Judicial Abuse of Discretion,
Racial Terrorism Conspiracy, Perjury, Chicanery,
Public, Political, Fraternal Corruption Conspiracies,
Perjury, Fraud on the Courts and other Un-
Constitutional Lawless Violations.

And here is the caption of still another document that Knight has proffered to accompany her Complaint:

PETITION FOR RULE TO SHOW CAUSE REMANDING CIRCUIT JUDGE
DAVID B. ATKINS & ATTORNEYS DUTTON & DUTTON BANK
OFFICIALS CORROBORATION IN AN ORGANIZED CHAIN
CONSPIRACY "PERJURY" "FRAUD OF ALL SORTS"/CONTEMPT OF
COURT OTHER IRREGULARITIES REMAND/BODY ATTACHMENT
INSTANTER
MANDATORY INJUNCTION PROHIBITING SEIZING HOME

This Court has waded through the welter of documents provided by Knight, who has quite understandably not expended (or, more accurately, wasted) the \$350 filing fee needed to gain entry to the federal courthouse door. Instead she has accompanied the other documents with two forms provided by this District Court's Clerk's Office (an In Forma Pauperis Application ["Application"] and a Motion for Appointment of Counsel ["Motion"]), which she has completed with handwritten information. But well-established Seventh Circuit law requires that any plaintiff who seeks in forma pauperis treatment must not only show inadequate financial resources but must also assert a nonfrivolous claim (in the legal sense). Knight has obviously flunked that latter requirement.

Accordingly the Application is denied, while the Motion is denied without prejudice. If Knight were to pay the \$350 filing

fee on or before January 25, 2012, this action could go forward.²
But if she does not, this Court will be constrained to dismiss
both the Complaint and this action.



Milton I. Shadur
Senior United States District Judge

Date: January 5, 2012

² As a caveat, Knight would be well advised to think hard before making such an expenditure, for the nature of what she has tendered to this point makes her ability to present a viable claim seriously questionable.